Case 3:08-cv-00472-J-LSP Document 5 Filed 04/14/2008 Page 1 of 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

FILED

		2008 APR 14 PM 26 5-3e for Clerk's Office File Stamp
тΩ.		CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
TO:		T JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	OM: <u>R. Mullin,</u>	Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 4/10/2008
	SE NO.: <u>08cv0472</u>	2 J (LSP) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner
CASE TITLE: Parra v. Tilton, et al		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for IFP		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
<b>√</b> 1	Local Rule	Discrepancy
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		OTHER: Document already on file (Docket #2) and granted (Docket #4).
	•	<b>Date forwarded:</b> 4/10/2008
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
T IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
X) 	The document is to	be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that copy of this order on all parties.		
	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by c	
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1	
		CHAMBERS OF:
	Dated: 4/11/01	Ву: (ДДД)